



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/620,484	07/20/2000	Robert Carlquist Smith	99-317	3095
32127	7590	05/13/2004	EXAMINER	
VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC. C/O CHRISTIAN R. ANDERSEN 600 HIDDEN RIDGE DRIVE MAILCODE HQEO3H14 IRVING, TX 75038			RYMAN, DANIEL J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2665	8

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/620,484

Applicant(s)

SMITH, ROBERT CARLQUIST

Examiner

Daniel J. Ryman

Art Unit

2665

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,10-20,25 and 27-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,10-20,25 and 27-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-20, 25, and 27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 25, 27, 30, and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mattaway et al (USPN 6,275,490).
4. Regarding claims 1, 7, 13, 25, and 30, Mattaway discloses a method of and system for making a telephone call using an electronic document, comprising the steps of and means for: receiving an electronic document that includes data representing at least one telephone number (col. 3, lines 27-44; col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 15; and col. 9, line 61-col. 10, line 15); selecting a telephone number from a location in the electronic document (col. 3, lines 27-44; col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 15; and col. 9, line 61-col. 10, line 15); retrieving data, associated with the location, from the electronic document, wherein the data comprises the telephone number in a format usable for setting up a call (col. 3, lines 27-44; col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 15; and col. 9, line 61-col. 10, line 15); and signaling, via a packet-switched network, a telecommunication system to connect a call between the telephone number and a calling party telephone number using the

retrieved data (col. 3, lines 27-44; col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 15; col. 9, line 61-col. 10, line 15; and col. 10, line 45-col. 11, line 16).

5. Regarding claims 2 and 8, referring to claims 1 and 7, Mattaway discloses that the call is connected across a circuit-switched network (col. 3, lines 27-44; col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 15; col. 9, line 61-col. 10, line 15; and col. 10, line 45-col. 11, line 16).

6. Regarding claims 4 and 10, referring to claims 1 and 7, Mattaway discloses that the selecting includes: selecting the telephone number from the electronic document via a mouse (ref. 157; col. 3, lines 27-44; col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 15; col. 9, line 61-col. 10, line 15; and col. 10, line 45-col. 11, line 16).

7. Regarding claims 5 and 11, referring to claims 1 and 7, Mattaway discloses that the electronic document comprises at least one of an e-mail, a word processing file and a web page (col. 3, lines 27-44; col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 15; col. 9, line 61-col. 10, line 15; and col. 10, line 45-col. 11, line 16).

8. Regarding claim 27, Mattaway inherently discloses a method of formatting an electronic document, comprising: receiving characters for placement in an electronic document (col. 3, lines 27-44; col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 15; col. 9, line 61-col. 10, line 15; and col. 10, line 45-col. 11, line 16); analyzing the received characters to determine if any of the characters form a telephone number (col. 3, lines 27-44; col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 15; col. 9, line 61-col. 10, line 15; and col. 10, line 45-col. 11, line 16); identifying a location of the characters determined to form the telephone number in the electronic document (col. 3, lines 27-44; col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 15; col. 9, line 61-col. 10, line 15; and col. 10, line 45-col. 11, line 16); and associating data, including the telephone number in a format usable for setting up a telephone call, with the

location of the characters determined to comprise the telephone number (col. 3, lines 27-44; col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 15; col. 9, line 61-col. 10, line 15; and col. 10, line 45-col. 11, line 16).

9. Regarding claim 33, referring to claim 30, Mattaway discloses that the electronic document comprises a web page (col. 3, lines 27-44; col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 15; col. 9, line 61-col. 10, line 15; and col. 10, line 45-col. 11, line 16).

10. Regarding claim 34, referring to claim 30, Mattaway discloses that the remote device, responsive to receipt of the message, signals a telecommunication system to set up a call between the telephone number and the calling party telephone number (col. 3, lines 27-44; col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 15; col. 9, line 61-col. 10, line 15; and col. 10, line 45-col. 11, line 16).

11. Regarding claim 35, referring to claim 30, Mattaway discloses that characters corresponding to the telephone number are associated with the location in the electronic document (col. 3, lines 27-44; col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 15; and col. 9, line 61-col. 10, line 15).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 6, 12, and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mattaway et al (USPN 6,275,490) in view of Wiener et al (USPN 6,324,264).

14. Regarding claims 6 and 12, referring to claims 1 and 7, Mattaway does not expressly disclose receiving, prior to signaling, the calling party telephone number; and storing the calling party telephone number. Wiener teaches, in a system for establishing a communications call,

Art Unit: 2665

receiving, prior to signaling, the calling party telephone number; and storing the calling party telephone number in order to correctly charge the user (Fig. 6; col. 3, line 52-col. 4, line 10; and col. 5, lines 13-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to receive, prior to signaling, the calling party telephone number and to store the calling party telephone number in order to correctly charge the user.

15. Regarding claims 14, 17, and 20, Mattaway discloses a method of and system for making a telephone call using an electronic document, the method comprising the steps of and the system comprising means for: receiving, at a computer, an electronic document that includes data representing a telephone number (col. 3, lines 27-44; col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 15; and col. 9, line 61-col. 10, line 15); selecting a telephone number from the electronic document (col. 3, lines 27-44; col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 15; and col. 9, line 61-col. 10, line 15); retrieving data, based on the selection, from the electronic document, wherein the data comprises the telephone number in a format usable for setting up a telephone call (col. 3, lines 27-44; col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 15; and col. 9, line 61-col. 10, line 15). Mattaway does not expressly disclose connecting, if the computer includes a packetized telephone, a packet-switched call to a first telephone associated with the telephone number; and connecting, if the computer does not include a packetized telephone, a circuit-switched call between the first telephone and a second telephone associated with a calling party using the retrieved data; however, Mattaway does disclose that the call can be connected either over a packet-switched network or a circuit switched network where a gateway is used to make the connection over the circuit-switched network (col. 3, lines 27-44; col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 15; col. 9, line 61-col. 10, line 15; and col. 10, line 45-col. 11, line 16). Examiner notes that Mattaway assumes that every computer contains Internet phone capabilities.

Art Unit: 2665

Wiener teaches, in a system for establishing a communication call, connecting, if the computer includes a packetized telephone, a packet-switched call to a first telephone associated with the telephone number; and connecting, if the computer does not include a packetized telephone, a circuit-switched call between the first telephone and a second telephone associated with a calling party using the retrieved data (col. 5, line 3-col. 6, line 22 and col. 9, line 46-col. 11, line 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to connect, if the computer includes a packetized telephone, a packet-switched call to a first telephone associated with the telephone number; and to connect, if the computer does not include a packetized telephone, a circuit-switched call between the first telephone and a second telephone associated with a calling party using the retrieved data in order to allow for the situation in which the calling party does not have Internet phone capabilities.

16. Regarding claims 15 and 18, referring to claims 14 and 17, Mattaway in view of Wiener discloses that the selecting includes: selecting the telephone number from the electronic document via a mouse (Mattaway: ref. 157; col. 3, lines 27-44; col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 15; col. 9, line 61-col. 10, line 15; and col. 10, line 45-col. 11, line 16).

17. Regarding claims 16 and 19, referring to claims 14 and 17, Mattaway in view of Wiener discloses that the electronic document comprises at least one of an e-mail, a word processing file or a web page (Mattaway: col. 3, lines 27-44; col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 15; and col. 9, line 61-col. 10, line 15).

18. Claims 28, 29, 31, 32, 36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mattaway et al (USPN 6,275,490).

Art Unit: 2665

19. Regarding claims 28 and 36, referring to claims 27 and 35, Mattaway does not expressly disclose bolding and underlining the characters determined to comprise a telephone number; however, Mattaway does disclose that the characters are an HTML tag. Examiner takes official notice that it is well known to bold and underline the characters in an HTML tag in order to distinguish the HTML tag from normal text. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to bold and underline the characters determined to comprise a telephone number in order to distinguish the characters from normal text.

20. Regarding claims 29 and 37, referring to claims 27 and 35, Mattaway does not expressly disclose portraying the characters determined to comprise a telephone number in a different color than other surrounding characters; however, Mattaway does disclose that the characters are an HTML tag. Examiner takes official notice that it is well known to portray the characters determined to comprise an HTML tag in a different color in order to distinguish the HTML tag from normal text. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to portray the characters determined to comprise a telephone number in a different color than other surrounding characters in order to distinguish the characters of the telephone number from normal text.

21. Regarding claim 31, referring to claim 30, Mattaway does not expressly disclose that the electronic document comprises an e-mail; however, Mattaway does disclose that the addresses are HTML tags. Examiner takes official notice that it is well known to use HTML tags in e-mails in order to extend the benefits of HTML tags to other types of electronic documents. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the

electronic document comprise an e-mail in order to allow the benefits of the call establishment method to extend to e-mails.

22. Regarding claim 32, referring to claim 30, Mattaway does not expressly disclose that the electronic document comprises a word processing file; however, Mattaway does disclose that the addresses are HTML tags. Examiner takes official notice that it is well known to use HTML tags in word processing files in order to extend the benefits of HTML tags to other types of electronic documents. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the electronic document comprise a word processing file in order to allow the benefits of the call establishment method to extend to word processing files.

Conclusion

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Narain et al (USPN 6,535,506) see entire document which pertains to establishing communications based on hypertext calling received from a packet network.

24. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2665

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel J. Ryman whose telephone number is (703)305-6970. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:00-5:00 with every other Friday off.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (703)308-6602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Daniel J. Ryman
Examiner
Art Unit 2665

DJR

Daniel J. Ryman



HUY D. VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600